

Date: Tue, 12 Oct 93 04:30:23 PDT
From: Ham-Digital Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-digital@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Digital-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Digital@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Digital Digest V93 #71
To: Ham-Digital

Ham-Digital Digest Tue, 12 Oct 93 Volume 93 : Issue 71

Today's Topics:

 Dataengine Mod Wanted (2 msgs)
 Dual plug
 FM3 Data Transmission
 Getting into Packet without a TNC (2 msgs)
 PK-232MBX TNC For Sale
 Public Apology (3 msgs)
 re: Public Apology (2 msgs)
 re: Public Apology - get real!

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Digital@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Digital-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Digital Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-digital".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Mon, 11 Oct 1993 17:33:20 GMT
From: news.mentorg.com!wv.mentorg.com!hanko@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Dataengine Mod Wanted
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

Please post - probably a lot of us interested in this one!

... Hank

In article <60.1009.5731.0N185C22@canrem.com>, steve.jones@canrem.com (Steve Jones) writes:
|> Can anyone E-mail me the mod that allows the Dataengine to do 19k2 with an
|> open squelch without generating a mess of interrupts? I seem to recall
|> this would also fix the garbage calls in the mheard list. We're running

```
|> some Dataengines at 19k2 and notice alot of CRC errors. We assume that this
|> is due to the Dataengine 'falsing' on the open squelch noise.
|> Thanks in advance,
|>
|> Steve Jones <steve.jones@canrem.com>
|>
|> -----BEGIN PGP PUBLIC KEY BLOCK-----
|> Version: 2.3a
|>
|> mQA9AiyznJYAAAEbGLo58lXwene0xZytrUzarHz0d6AUPmaWnI0udeHtwZlTvKlq
|> ZVTimEYShF10BcGHZQAFebQkU3RldmUgSm9uZXMGPHN0ZXZlLmpvbmVzQGNhbnJl
|> bS5jb20+
|> =nIy/
|> -----END PGP PUBLIC KEY BLOCK-----
|>
|> * Q-Blue v0.7 [NR] *
```

--

Hank Oredson @ Mentor Graphics
Internet : hank_oredson@mentorg.com
Amateur Radio: WORLI@WORLI.OR.USA.NA

Date: Mon, 11 Oct 1993 18:52:28 GMT
From: ncrwg2.ncr.com!ncrhub2!law7!cn292.DaytonOH.NCR.COM.25.149.IN-ADDR.AR\1!
jra@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Dataengine Mod Wanted
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

In article <60.1009.5731.0N185C22@canrem.com> steve.jones@canrem.com (Steve Jones)
writes:

```
>Can anyone E-mail me the mod that allows the Dataengine to do 19k2 with an
>open squelch without generating a mess of interrupts? I seem to recall
>this would also fix the garbage calls in the mheard list. We're running
>some Dataengines at 19k2 and notice alot of CRC errors. We assume that this
>is due to the Dataengine 'falsing' on the open squelch noise.
>Thanks in advance,
```

I don't have a specific mod for the DataEngine handy, but anything that will
gate the RXD signal with DCD will work.

If you're using the D4-10 radios, a simple fix is to put a diode from pin 2 of
U1 in the radio to pin 2 of the TTL level DB9. Point the cathode at U1. The
two points are close to each other on the circuit board, and the diode can be
tacked onto the bottom of the board.

This will apply a positive voltage to the data slicer reference input when no signal is present, effectively clamping the RXD output. When the squelch opens up, the DCD line goes low. The data slicer is now unclamped and can generate RXD based on a real signal (the diode prevents the DCD line from sinking the slicer reference to ground when DCD goes low).

It's a brute force method, but it works.

73,
John AG9V

Date: 11 Oct 1993 13:20:37 -0500
From: swrinde!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!news.kei.com!bloom-beacon.mit.edu!TAMUTS.TAMU.EDU!news.utdallas.edu!corpgate!crchh327.bnr.ca!kharker@network.ucsd
Subject: Dual plug
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

me explain. Eventually, I am going to be building a new cable to go from the back of my tnc and into the top of my present or future ht. The connector on the tnc end of things is a simple DB-9, so that's not a problem. What I am wondering about is the ht end. I am only going to have one vhf radio for quite a while, so my ht will have to serve as my packet station, my mobile voice station, and my base voice station. I will therefore need to be plugging and unplugging this future cable quite a bit. The top of almost all ht's (mine included) have two plugs - a min and sub-mini - for speaker and mic respectively. As far as I can tell, all ht's use the same spacing between these two plugs as well.

Now, this may seem like a pretty silly problem, and it may even boil down to just a matter of aesthetics. I would like to just plug in and pull out a single plug rather than two. I would like the cable to have one and only one connector on each end, rather than one connector on the tnc end and two connectors on the ht end. I've given up on trying to find a source that makes the mini-and-sub-mini-plugs-in-one connector (although I have seen it on enough remote speaker mics and MFJ's pre-fab packet cables to have held out hope...), so I am wondering if anyone else has tried to build some sort of casing to hold the two plugs in their appropriate seperation, and is sturdy enough to allow for a lot of plugging and unplugging. Perhaps using heat shrink tubing? Nylon wire ties? Cutting open a stereo headphone Y connector and gluing it back together with cryocanalate (sp?) glue?

Or, alternatively, does anyone have a damaged, destroyed, mutilated, or otherwise useless ht speaker mic with the mini-and-sub-mini-plugs-in-one connector on it that they'd be willing to donate/sell to me so I could try and use that connector?

Any ideas on this are appreciated.

_ken/n1pvb

--

```
=====
Kenneth E. Harker      Bell Northern Research      "Any opinions expressed
kharker@bnr.ca         Richardson, Texas, USA      are solely mine and do
N1PVB                  (214) 684-5115          not represent BNR"
=====
```

Date: 12 Oct 1993 01:10:16 GMT
From: dlane@ucsd.edu
Subject: FM3 Data Transmission
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

Is anyone familiar with the FM3 method of data transmission? I have been told that this consists of placing an fsk signal on an fm 2 carrier...query: what type of equipment would be necessary for reception of such a signal (ie., demodulation and fsk decoding)?

Also anybody have info, sources of info for data reception information such as this? Please no suggestions of Hidden Signals by Harrington (I gave my copy to a local plebian on his way out of Rome)...I'd really appreciate any (!) sources of info pertinent to the twentieth century however 8-).

Date: 11 Oct 1993 19:32:00 GMT
From: pipex!warwick!kinguni!usenet%ceres@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Getting into Packet without a TNC
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

Excuse me if I seem ill-informed but that is exactly what I am. I am interested in getting into packet but only know what I have read in a short booklet on the subject. One thing I did pick up though, was that it is possible to get programs for a PC to do all the work usually done by the TNC. Would anyone know where I could get hold of such a program? (Source code in 'c' would be even better.)

Thanks in advance,

-Niall

--*****--

Niall Pagdin, Student Advisory (SC), Kingston University,
Kingston-upon-Thames, London, England.
E-Mail: niall@crystal.king.ac.uk

- G7 PDX -

"Only those who attempt the absurd, achieve the impossible!"

Date: 11 Oct 93 22:13:22 GMT
From: mulvey!rich@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Getting into Packet without a TNC
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

Niall Pagdin (ap_v132@dc.s.king.ac.uk) wrote:

: Excuse me if I seem ill-informed but that is exactly what I am.
: I am interested in getting into packet but only know what I have read in
: a short booklet on the subject. One thing I did pick up though, was that
: it is possible to get programs for a PC to do all the work usually done
: by the TNC. Would anyone know where I could get hold of such a program?
: (Source code in 'c' would be even better.)

Well, you can set it up so that the PC does *most*, but not *all* of the work. You still need an interface to the xcvr, as PC's don't include the necessary hardware to perform the modulation/demodulation of the signals. The Baycom modem is the most popular in this class, it's basically a dongle that attaches to your serial port, while the TNC functionality is handled by software. Also, I understand that some people have used Soundblaster boards to the same effect. Just browse through any Amateur Radio mag, and you'll see ads for Baycom modems and the equivalent. Personally, I prefer to use a "real" TNC, since it can be used by any device that can talk via a serial port, which includes palmtop computers, Mac's, Next's, etc. Baycom-type modems are limited to whatever the software runs on. :-)

- Rich

--

Rich Mulvey Amateur Radio: N2VDS Rochester, NY
rich@mulvey.com "Ignorance should be painful."

Date: 9 Oct 93 12:09:35 GMT
From: ncar!vexcel!copper!mercury.cair.du.edu!mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx!
rchalk@ames.arpa

Subject: PK-232MBX TNC For Sale
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

I have an AEA Packet Terminal Node Controller For Sale, model PK-232MBX,
in good condition, with all cables and manuals, as well as software.

Current price for these is around \$350.00. Asking \$250.00

e-mail, or phone 404-587-1613

Richard, VE3NAS/W4, Atlanta, GA

Date: Mon, 11 Oct 1993 17:36:43 GMT
From: news.mentorg.com!wv.mentorg.com!hanko@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Public Apology
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

Now now ... careful!

The SPCP (Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Potatoes)
will be after you if you are not careful !

... Hank

In article <299d5d\$evr@unicorn.ccc.nottingham.ac.uk>, eeyimkn@unicorn.nott.ac.uk
(M. Knell) writes:

|> Jeesus, what a loser. Packet BBS's (PBBS = Packet, not public :-)) are run
|> over here at least under the total authority of the sysop involved - the sysop
|> has the absolute final say over whether a message can sit on his hard disk or
|> not. This is in a way a kind of symptom of what's wrong with the network - this
|> jerk thinks he can threaten to sue someone for not carrying one of his
|> messages, when in actual fact as the originator he has no legal rights AT ALL
|> concerning where his message can go. People are beginning to take the system
|> for granted and assume that they can do anything they want.

|>
|> Grr. This has put me in a bad mood now - howsabout locking this guy out of the
|> entire network? *grin*

|>
|> 73 Mike
|> (off to punch a sack of potatoes for half an hour to stop feeling quite so
|> livid)

|>
|>
|> --

|> +----- 0 Mike Knell, University of Nottingham, UK --+

```
|> |      Nevertheless..      -/ \- Internet: eeyimkn@unicorn.nott.ac.uk      |
|> |      the Turtle Moves!    -\_/- AX25: g7gpa@gb7bad.#23.gbr.eu      |
|> +---M.T.V. - GET OFF THE AIR!-- |      AMPRnet: mpk@hobbes.g7gpa.ampr.org -----+
```

--

Hank Oredson @ Mentor Graphics
Internet : hank_oredson@mentorg.com
Amateur Radio: WORLI@WORLI.OR.USA.NA

Date: 11 Oct 1993 19:25:00 GMT
From: pipex!warwick!kinguni!usenet%ceres@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Public Apology
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

I have just finished reading the message which prompted this 'formal apology'. I wish I had packet access at the mo' so I could tell the guy JUST what I think! Unbelievable that people really think they can get away with making threats like that! Is it possible to sent 200KVolts wrapped up in a packet?

-Niall

-----*

Niall Pagdin, Student Advisory (SC), Kingston University,
Kingston-upon-Thames, London, England.
E-Mail: niall@crystal.king.ac.uk

- G7PDX -

"Only those who attempt the absurd, achieve the impossible!"

Date: 12 Oct 93 00:30:13 GMT
From: munnari.oz.au!metro!news.ci.com.au!eram!dave@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Public Apology
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

So, who is this prawn, "Randy KF8TV @ W8HHF" ? Some wanna-be lawyer?
Are there any more like him over there?

--

Dave Horsfall (VK2KFU)	VK2KFU @ VK2RWI.NSW.AUS.OC	PGP 2.3
dave@esi.COM.AU	...munari!esi.COM.AU!dave	available

Date: 11 Oct 93 10:22:22 EDT
From: psinnntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net
Subject: re: Public Apology
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc, kf5mg@vnet.ibm.com (Jack Snodgrass) writes:

[deleted relayed packet message from individual so clueless as to think he can sue someone for not relaying his packet message, and who apparently has an attorney who knows a fish when he sees one; also deleted response from SYSOP with stuck caps-lock key.]

Thanks for the update, Jack. Now I remember why I quit checking into the local PBBS. It's interesting to see that the intellectual level of PBBS traffic hasn't risen any.

Jon Bloom, KE3Z | jbbloom@arrl.org
American Radio Relay League |
225 Main St., Newington CT 06111 |

Date: Mon, 11 Oct 1993 16:41:38 GMT
From: tadpole.com!news.dell.com!swrinde!menudo.uh.edu!uuneo!sugar!
sfarlow@uunet.uu.net
Subject: re: Public Apology
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

AGAIN, amateur radio is a HOBBY and is VOLUNTEER. As such, anyone wh
CHOOSES to run a PBBS has full rights to control what leaves his PBBS
or gets posted there. That goofy lawyer and the guy who hired him ought
to apologize to that SYSOP for their behavior.

o

Date: Mon, 11 Oct 1993 17:41:22 GMT
From: news.mentorg.com!wv.mentorg.com!hanko@uunet.uu.net
Subject: re: Public Apology - get real!
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

Just a comment on use of PBBS - back in the "old days" circa 1984,
PBBS meant "Personal BBS" - i.e. one user. Changed to "Packet BBS"
perhaps sometime in the 1987 time frame. The lingo changes so fast
it's hard to keep up ! Now maybe it will mean "Public BBS" <har har>.

... Hank

In article <MARK.489.2CB8A2C6@ardsley.business.uwo.ca>,
MARK@ardsley.business.uwo.ca (Mark_Bramwell) writes:

```
|> > I am, at this very
|> >moment, consulting with my attorney about ways to prosecute you.  Even IF i
|>
|> >You, my friend, have made a grave error.  You stand to lose considerably.  If
|> >possible, I intend to have your liscense over this issue.  If you think I'm
|> >just blowing steam, please think about how long it has taken me to reply to
|> >your message -- obviously a lot of thought and work has gone into the project.
|> > You, sir, will be off the air FOREVER!  Now, how do you feel?  Do you want
|> >to delete any more of my messages?  Your liscense is mine!
|>
|>
|> With atitudes like this, and random tourist shootings, its no wonder the US
|> has a bad rap with the world in general.
|>
|> ps:  I do believe the 'p' in pbbs is  'packet'  NOT 'public'.

|>
|>
|> Too bad these guys have the ability to spread their ideas world-wide via
|> shortwave.
|>
|> Proud to be Canadian!
|>
|> =====
|> Mark Bramwell, VE3PZR                      Located in sunny London, Ontario
|>
|> Internet: Mark@ARDSLEY.business.uwo.ca  IP Address: 129.100.22.33
|>   Packet:  VE3PZR @ VE3GYQ                UWO Phone: (519) 661-3714
```

--

Hank Oredson @ Mentor Graphics
Internet : hank_oredson@mentorg.com
Amateur Radio: WORLI@WORLI.OR.USA.NA

Date: 11 Oct 93 20:50:19 GMT
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!math.ohio-state.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!
biosci!barrnet.net!cronos!Metaphor.COM!henniger@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

References <CEHDD4.19q5@hawnews.watson.ibm.com>,
<SBROWN.930ct8063333@charon.dseg.ti.com>, <29440u\$1qi@hp-col.col.hp.com>ro
Reply-To : henniger@Metaphor.COM (Mickey Henniger)
Subject : Re: info on cellular mods - illegal?

In article <29440u\$1qi@hp-col.col.hp.com>, jms@col.hp.com (Mike Stansberry)
writes:

|> Steve Brown (sbrown@charon.dseg.ti.com) wrote:
|> : In article <MARK.487.2CB48F52@ardsley.business.uwo.ca>
|> : MARK@ardsley.business.uwo.ca (Mark_Bramwell) writes, commenting on
|> : a posting from Jack, kf5mg:
|>
|> : > In this case, the person is whining because the pbbs operator was unwilling
|> : > to have detailed information on how to perform an illegal act on his
machine.
|>
|> : I thought I remembered something in Part 97 (U.S. Radio Law) to the
|> : effect that it was illegal for an amateur radio operator to engage in
|> : communications which supported illegal activities, however, I searched
|> : through my on-line copy of Part 97 this morning and couldn't find it.
|> : Prior to searching Part 97, I would have taken the position that the
|> : Packet BBS operator was not only well within his rights but also
|> : defending his license by killing the message containing instructions
|> : for performing an illegal act.
|>
|> : Am I dreaming that Part 97 previously had such a prohibition in it?
|> : Or, maybe I just overlooked the prohibition still in Part 97.
|>
|> under part 97.113 Prohibited transmissions:
|>
|> (a) No amateur shall transmit:
|>
|> (4) Music using a phone emission except as specifically provided
|> elsewhere in this Section; communications intended to facilitate a
|> ^^^
|> criminal act;.....more stuff in this section (a)(4) not included.
|> ^^^^^^^^^^^^^
|>
|> If a message is intended to help a person modify a scanner/radio to
|> receive cell phone conversations, which is unlawful (has been for
|> some time, but somewhat unenforceable, IMHO), then that message
|> (communication) is not allowed by FCC rules...
|>
|> You decide...
|> Mike, K0TER

The modification in question is to allow the radio to receive frequencies which were originally designed in the radio. This is not illegal.

If the modification were to allow the radio to receive cellular communication, this also would not be illegal, since it is not illegal to receive cellular communication -- if you do not intend to listen to the conversation (there is more than just conversations going on in this frequency range.)

If the modified radio were used to listen to cellular conversations, and those involved in the conversation believed that the conversation was private, (i.e. at least one of them were not on a cellular phone) and the listener did not have permission to listen from those talking, then this act of listening would be illegal.

To say that it is illegal to pass information which, if used in a certain way would lead to acts which were illegal - is preposterous.

That is like saying that since cars which can drive over 65 MPH can be used illegally, possession of such a car should be illegal- or in this case - knowledge of how to obtain the car should be illegal to pass over the radio. Knowledge of how to obtain tires rated at over 165 MPH should be illegal to pass over the radio....

....BAN CORVETTES! BOYCOTT MICHELIN!....

My point is that it is absolutely not illegal under 97 to pass this info. Furthermore it is not illegal under the Privacy act of '86.

- summary:

1. if someone is passing information which MAY then allow them to more easily perform illegal acts then it is illegal to not censor it on your pbbs (i disagree)
2. if someone is passing information which WILL be used to perform illegal acts it is illegal to not censor it on your pbbs (i agree)
3. you have the right to censor whatever you want on your own pbbs (i agree)

Mick
(wb5von)

Date: Mon, 11 Oct 1993 18:39:17 GMT
From: ncrigw2.ncr.com!ncrhub2!law7!cn292.DaytonOH.NCR.COM.25.149.IN-ADDR.AR\1!
jra@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

References <9310020032.AA07674@ingersoll.com>, <CEFCo3.M81@csn.org>,
<294h98INN72s@gap.caltech.edu>.com
Subject : Re: DVR4-10's @ 450mhz

In article <294h98INN72s@gap.caltech.edu> pjb@cco.caltech.edu (Paul J. Brewer)
writes:

>A few of us in southern california are using them on 439.025 mhz with
>no problems, at 9600 bd.

>Thats not 450, but its halfway there. Wonder why they made these things
>for 431? Did it save um any money? Anyone got the scoop on this?

What passes for a bandplan on 70cm sets up 430.0 to 431.0 for 100kHz wide data
channels (on .05 MHz centers). 19.2kB needs more than an NBFM bandwidth, so
the D4-10 was targeted to use those channels.

Of course, in some areas ATV activity at a video carrier of 426.75 is enough
to cause problems in the 430-431 range...

John AG9V

End of Ham-Digital Digest V93 #71
